



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/929,019	09/15/1997	PAUL T DECRAENE	5291/54391	1336

7590 01/02/2002

TIMOTHY T PATULA
PATULA & ASSOCIATES
116 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE
14TH FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60603

EXAMINER

HAROLD, JEFFEREY F

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2644

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

OPM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/929,019

Applicant(s)

DECRAENE, PAUL T

Examiner

Jefferey F. Harold

Art Unit

2644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. **Claims 1-3 and 17-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Collins et al. (United States Patent 4,945,560), hereinafter referenced as Collins.

Regarding **claim 1**, Collins discloses a telephone network interface apparatus. In addition, Collins discloses a telephone network interface apparatus (10), as disclosed at column 4, lines 60-63 and exhibited in figures 1-3, comprising:

a network interface section (17), as disclosed at column 5, lines 32-34 and figure 3, for selectively receiving a plurality of individually replaceable subscriber line interface modules (70), as disclosed at column 5, lines 32-38 and exhibited in figure 2;

twenty five pairs of connectors (22), as disclosed at column 5, lines 18-27 and exhibited in figure 3, operatively connected to the network interface section (17), as disclosed at column 5, lines 32-34 and exhibited in figure 3; and

a subscriber interface module (70) selectively connectable to either one of the twenty five pairs of connectors(22), as disclosed at column 5, lines 34-38 and exhibited in figure 3.

Regarding **claim 2**, Collins discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition, Collins discloses wherein the telephone network interface

apparatus (10) further comprises a cover (44) for the network interface section (17), as disclosed at column 6, lines 21-26, and exhibited in figure 1.

Regarding **claim 3**, Collins discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 2), in addition, Collins discloses wherein the cover (44) includes openings (39) for allowing placement of the cover (44) around the subscriber interface module (70), as disclosed at column 6, line 59 through column 7, line 14 and exhibited in figure 4.

Regarding **claim 17**, Collins discloses a telephone network interface apparatus. In addition, Collins discloses a telephone network interface apparatus (10), as disclosed at column 4, lines 60-63 and exhibited in figures 1-3, for selectively receiving and housing a plurality of individually replaceable subscriber line interface modules (70), as disclosed at column 5, lines 32-38 and exhibited in figure 2, with the apparatus (10) providing flexibility in mounting in the presence of an obstruction and comprised:

a network interface section (17), as disclosed at column 5, lines 32-34 and exhibited in figure 3, having twenty five pairs of connectors (22), as disclosed at column 5, lines 18-27 and exhibited in figure 3, and

a subscriber interface module (70) selectively and removably connectable to either one of the twenty five pairs of connectors (22) when proximate to the obstruction, as disclosed at column 5, lines 34-38 and exhibited in figure 3.

Regarding **claim 18**, Collins discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 17), in addition, Collins discloses a cover (44) for the a network interface section (17), as disclosed at column 5, lines 32-34 and exhibited in figure 3, the cover (44) selectively positionable over and removable outwardly away from the network interface

section (17) so as to be unhindered by the obstruction, as disclosed at column 6, lines 21-26 and exhibited in figure 1.

Regarding **claim 19**, Collins discloses a telephone network interface apparatus (10). In addition, Collins discloses a method of mounting a telephone network interface apparatus in a difficult to access location, the method comprising the steps of:

providing a network interface section (17), as disclosed at column 5, lines 32-34 and exhibited in figure 3, having twenty five pairs of connectors (22), as disclosed at column 5, lines 18-27 and exhibited in figure 3;

providing a subscriber interface module (70) selectively and removably attachable to the network interface section (17), as disclosed at column 5, lines 34-38 and exhibited in figure 3; and

selectively attaching the subscriber interface module (70) to one of the twenty five pairs of connectors (22), as disclosed at column 5, lines 18-27 and exhibited in figure 3.

2. **Claims 4 and 6** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bremenour et al. (United States Patent 4,152,750), hereinafter referenced as Bremenour.

Regarding **claim 4**, Bremenour discloses an I/O interface rack for solid state control system. Bremenour further discloses an I/O interface rack for solid state control system for I/O modules (25), as disclosed at column 3, lines 56-58 and exhibited in figure 1, the I/O interface rack for solid state control system includes a circuit board (11) and adapter module (26), as disclosed as column 3, lines 1-3 and lines 56-66, and

exhibited in figures 2 and 3, for interconnecting the inherent customer lines and inherent network service provider lines, as evidenced by the fact that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that customer lines and network service provider lines would have been provided for communication between the customer equipment and the service provider, through the I/O modules (25), the inherent network service provider lines being connected to a I/O interface rack which is operatively connected to the circuit board (11) and adapter module (26), as disclosed at column 4, lines 2-7, the inherent network service provider lines being connected to the circuit board (11) and adapter module (26) the via terminal blocks (17 and 18) provided on the circuit board (11) and adapter module (26), as disclosed at column 5, lines 21-27 and exhibited in figure 2, comprising;

two connectors (28 and 29), as disclosed at column 4, lines 2-14 and exhibited in figure 2, provided on the circuit board (11) and adapter module (26), the I/O interface rack being selectively connected to either of the connectors (28 and 29), to afford flexibility in mounting the I/O interface rack for solid state control system, as disclosed at column 4, lines 2-7.

Regarding **claim 6**, Bremenour discloses an I/O interface rack for solid state control system. Bremenour further discloses an I/O interface rack for solid state control system for receiving a plurality of I/O modules (25), as disclosed at column 3, lines 56-58 and exhibited in figure 1, and for interconnecting inherent customer lines with inherent network service provider lines, as evidenced by the fact that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that customer lines and network service provider

lines would have been provided for communication between the customer equipment and the service provider, the I/O interface rack for solid state control system comprising:

a circuit board (11) and adapter module (26), as disclosed as column 3, lines 1-3 and lines 56-66, and exhibited in figures 2 and 3;

a plurality of I/O modules connectors (30) on the circuit board (11) and adapter module (26) for receiving the I/O modules (25), as disclosed at column 4, lines 28-33 and exhibited in figures 1 and 2; and

at least two connectors (28 and 29), as disclosed at column 4, lines 2-14 and disclosed in figure 2, for selectively and independently receiving an I/O rack, as disclosed at column 4, lines 2-7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. ***Claims 5, 7 and 8*** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bremenour in view of Collins.

Regarding **claim 5**, Bremenour discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 4), in addition Bremenour discloses the I/O interface rack for solid state control system with an I/O rack, as disclosed at column 4, lines 2-7, connected to either of the at least two connectors (28 and 29), as disclosed at column 4, lines 2-14 and

disclosed in figure 2, however, Bremenour fails to disclose a cover having at least two customer interface module receiving openings to allow the cover to be positioned over various telecommunication equipment devices. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide a cover having at least two customer interface module receiving openings to allow the cover to be positioned over various telecommunication equipment devices, as taught by Collins.

Collins discloses a telephone network interface apparatus. Collins further discloses a cover (44) that includes openings (39) for allowing placement of the cover (44) around the subscriber interface module (70), as disclosed at column 6, line 59 through column 7, line 14 and exhibited in figure 4.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bremenour by specifically providing a cover having at least two customer interface module receiving openings to allow the cover to be positioned over various telecommunication equipment devices, as taught by Collins, for the purpose of protecting and securing the enclosed equipment.

Regarding **claim 7**, Bremenour discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 4), in addition, Bremenour discloses the I/O interface rack for solid state control system with a circuit board (11) and adapter module (26), as disclosed as column 3, lines 1-3 and lines 56-66, and exhibited in figures 2 and 3, and I/O modules (25) as disclosed at column 3, lines 56-58 and exhibited in figure 1. However, Bremenour fails to disclose a top flange, a bottom flange, a first side flange and a second side flange, wherein the top, bottom, first and second side flanges are

positioned generally perpendicular forming a housing area. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide a top flange, a bottom flange, a first side flange and a second side flange, wherein the top, bottom, first and second side flanges are positioned generally perpendicular forming a housing area, as taught by Collins.

Collins discloses a telephone network interface apparatus. Collins further discloses an enclosure (12), as disclosed at column 5, lines 1-40 and exhibited in figures 1-3, including a backplate (30) and divided into a left lateral portion (31), a right lateral portion (32), and an intermediate portion (33), as disclosed at column 5, lines 39-45 and disclosed in figure 3. The enclosure includes a side wall (40), top wall (36) and, a bottom wall (38), perpendicular to the backplate (30) with the walls spanning the left lateral portion (31) and the intermediate portion (33) wherein the walls form a housing area, as disclosed at column 5, lines 41-55 and exhibited in figure 3.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bremenour by specifically providing a top flange, a bottom flange, a first side flange and a second side flange, wherein the top, bottom, first and second side flanges are positioned generally perpendicular forming a housing area, as taught by Collins, to provide a space for which to insert various assemblies into an enclosure.

Regarding **claim 8**, the Bremenour and Collins combination discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 7), in addition, Bremenour discloses at least two connectors (28 and 29), as disclosed at column 4, lines 2-14 and disclosed in figure 2,

however, Bremenour fails to disclose a first customer interface module connector positioned along the first side flange and a second customer interface module connector positioned along the second side flange. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide a first customer interface module connector positioned along the first side flange and a second customer interface module connector positioned along the second side flange, as taught by Collins.

Collins further discloses a cable guide (50) and opening (39), as disclosed at column 6 line 52 through column 7 line 5 and exhibited in figures 4 and 8, positioned along the bottom wall (38), as disclosed at column 6, lines 59-63 and exhibited in figure 4, and a cable guide (50) and opening (37), as disclosed at column 7, lines 15-25 and exhibited in figures 8 and 11, positioned along the top wall (36), as disclosed at column 7, lines 30-40 and exhibited in figure 5.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bremenour by specifically providing a first customer interface module connector positioned along the first side flange and a second customer interface module connector positioned along the second side flange, as taught by Collins, to provide connectivity via either side of the module.

4. **Claim 9** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bremenour in view of Collins in further view of Reed (United States Patent 4,909,757).

Regarding **claim 9**, the Bremenour and Collins combination discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 8), in addition, the combination discloses I/O rack,

Art Unit: 2644

as disclosed at column 4, lines 2-7, and a circuit board (11) and adapter module (26), as disclosed at column 3, lines 1-3 and lines 56-66, and exhibited in figures 2 and 3, however, the combination fails to disclose at least one customer line connector being connected to at least one customer line connector in a parallel direction. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide at least one customer line connector being connected to at least one customer line connector in a parallel direction, at taught by Reed.

In a similar field of endeavor, Reed discloses a modular jack patch block. Reed further discloses a modular jack patch block (10), as disclosed at column 2, lines 43-51, and exhibited in figure 6, with at least one telephonic electrical connector (18), as disclosed at column 3 lines 35-40, and exhibited in figure 6, connected to a plurality of modular jacks (16) electrically connected to the telephonic electronic electrical connectors (18) via wires and leads, in a parallel direction, as disclosed at column 2, lines 49-54, and exhibited in figure 4.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bremenour combination by specifically providing at least one customer line connector being connected to at least one customer line connector in a parallel direction, at taught by Reed, to provide for easy connectivity in cramped installation applications.

5. **Claims 10, 11 and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bremenour in view of Collins in further view of well known prior art (MPEP 2144.03).

Regarding **claim 10**, the Bremenour combination discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 7), in addition, the Bremenour combination discloses a circuit board (11) and adapter module (26), as disclosed at column 3, lines 1-3 and lines 56-66, terminal blocks (17 and 18), as disclosed at column 5, lines 21-27 and exhibited in figure 2, wherein the inherent service provider lines, as evidenced by the fact that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that network service provider lines would have been provided for communication between the I/O interface rack for solid state control system and the service provider, are connected to terminal blocks (17 and 18), connected to circuit board (11) and adapter module (26), however, the Bremenour combination fails to specifically disclose a connector in a perpendicular direction. However, the examiner, takes official notice of the fact that it was well known in the art to provide a connector in a perpendicular direction.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bremenour combination for the purpose of providing easy connectivity of the network provider service in cramped installation applications.

Regarding **claim 11**, the Bremenour combination discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 10), in addition, the Bremenour combination discloses terminal blocks (17 and 18), as disclosed at column 5, lines 21-27 and exhibited in

figure 2, however, the Bremenour combination fails to disclose a terminal block located above the top flange. However, the examiner, take official notice of the fact that it is well known in the art to provide a terminal block located above the top flange.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bremenour combination for purpose of providing service line connections various locations.

Regarding **claim 16**, the Bremenour combination discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 11), in addition, the Bremenour combination discloses a I/O interface rack, and inherent network service provider lines, as evidenced by the fact that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that network service provider lines would have been provided for communication between the customer equipment and the service provider, as disclosed at column 4, lines 1-7, however, the Bremenour combination fails to specifically disclose a cover including top and bottom openings for allowing lines to pass through, first and second side flanges that extend beyond the top and bottom flange, and a cover, top and bottom flanges including openings for allowing lines to pass through. However, the examiner maintains that it was well know in the art to provide a cover including top and bottom openings for allowing lines to pass through, first and second side flanges that extend beyond the top and bottom flange, and a cover, top and bottom flanges including openings for allowing lines to pass through.

Regarding the cover including top and bottom openings for allowing lines to pass through, Collins further discloses a cover (44) that includes top and bottom opening (37

and 39) for allowing lines to pass through, as disclosed at column 6, line 59 through column 7, line 14 and exhibited in figure 4.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bremenour combination by specifically providing a cover including top and bottom openings for allowing lines to pass through, as taught by Collins, for the purpose of providing connection locations for subscriber and customer wires to pass through.

Regarding the first and second side flanges that extend beyond the top and bottom flange, and the top and bottom flanges including openings for allowing lines to pass through, the examiner takes official notice of the fact that it was well known in the art to provide the first and second side flanges that extend beyond the top and bottom flange, and the top and bottom flanges including openings for allowing lines to pass through.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bremenour combination for the purpose of providing various interface device arrangement to allow connectivity between customer and network service provider lines.

6. **Claims 12-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bremenour in view of Collins in further view of Jensen et al. (United States Patent 5,359,654), hereinafter referenced as Jensen.

Regarding, **claim 12** the Bremenour and Collins combination discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 7), in addition, Bremenour discloses a circuit board (11) and adapter module (26), as disclosed as column 3, lines 1-3 and lines 56-66, and exhibited in figures 2 and 3, however, Bremenour fails to specifically disclose a cover for enclosing with a top flange, bottom flange, and first and second side flanges. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide a cover for enclosing with a top flange, bottom flange, and first and second side flanges, as taught by Jensen.

In a similar field of endeavor, Jensen discloses a telecommunications network interface assembly. Jensen further discloses a telecommunications network interface assembly unit with a door member (16) for enclosing wherein the door member has a top flange, bottom flange, and first and second side flanges, as disclosed at column 4, lines 20-25 and exhibited in figure 1.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bremenour combination by specifically providing a cover for enclosing with a top flange, bottom flange, and first and second side flanges, as taught by Jensen, for ensuring the enclosure is completely covered.

Regarding, **claim 13** the Bremenour and Collins combination discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 12), in addition, the Bremenour combination discloses a I/O interface rack, as disclosed at column 4, lines 1-7, however, the Bremenour combination fails to disclose a cover with at least two cut out portions to allow clearance. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to

provide disclose a cover with at least two cut out portions to allow clearance, as taught by Jensen.

Jensen further discloses a telecommunication network interface assembly unit with a door member (16) that has at least two cut out portions to allow clearance of the of drop wires, as disclosed at column 4, lines 20-25 and exhibited in figure 1.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bremenour combination by specifically providing a cover with at least two cut out portions to allow clearance, as taught by Jensen, for the purposes of providing access to the enclosure.

Regarding, **claim 14** the Bremenour and Collins combination discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 12), in addition, Bremenour discloses an I/O interface rack for solid state control system, however, Bremenour fails to specifically disclose wherein a shelf telephone network interface apparatus was removably mounted to a back mounting plate. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide a shelf telephone network interface apparatus removably mounted to a back mounting plate, as taught by Collins.

Collins discloses a telephone network interface apparatus. Collins further discloses a telephone network interface apparatus removably mounted to a back plate (30), as disclosed at column 5, lines 39-53 and exhibited in figure 1A.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bremenour combination by specifically providing a shelf telephone network interface apparatus removably mounted to a back

mounting plate, as taught by Collins, for the purpose of providing for attachment and detachment of various devices to and from a support structure.

7. **Claims 15** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bremenour in view of Collins in view of Jensen in further view of well known prior art (MPEP 2144.03).

Regarding **claim 15**, the Bremenour combination discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 14), in addition, the Bremenour combination discloses a back mounting plate (30) with locking slots, as disclosed at column 5, lines 39-53, and exhibited in figure 1A, however, the Bremenour combination fails to specifically disclose a cover that includes locking tabs that selectively engage. However, the examiner, takes official notice of the fact that it was well known in the art to provide a cover that includes locking tabs that selectively engage.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bremenour combination for the purpose of providing a easily attachable and self securing cover.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed on October 20, 2001, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., customer interface module (70) is the device where all of the customer's lines attach) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are

interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., not modular and cannot be selectively detached and positioned) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., there is not two separate and distinct connectors (and locations) provided to attach the customer interface device 22 or 20) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument regarding the limitations that there are at least two customer interface module connectors 60, 61 on the shelf assembly, as well as a customer interface module 70 selectively connected to either one of the connectors 60, 61, the examiner respectively disagrees since, according to the above rejection it is clear how Collins more than adequately meets the claimed limitations.

Regarding applicant's arguments concerning cover 43, the examiner directs applicant to the above rejection where it is clear that the cover (44) more than adequately meets the claimed limitations.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., cover not placed over the entire shelf assembly) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regarding applicant's arguments concerning "removably outward", the examiner respectively disagrees since above rejection demonstrate how Collins more than adequately meets the claimed limitations.

Regarding applicant's arguments concerning "not meeting the claimed shelf assembly 40 having at least two customer interface module connectors 60, 61, and that the customer interface module 70 selectively connectors to either of the customer interface module connectors 60 or 61", the examiner respectively disagrees see above rejection.

In response to applicant's argument that the Bremenour reference is non-analogous art, in this instance Bremenour provides an interface unit used for communicating information.

Regarding applicant's argument concerning the "adapter module selectively detached and positioned", I/O interface rack is selectively interconnected to either of the connectors, thus meeting the claimed limitations.

Regarding applicant's argument concerning the "a plurality of connectors", the examiner respectively disagrees, see above rejection.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., not two separate and distinct connectors (and locations)) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regarding applicant's argument concerning not meeting "at least two customer interface module connectors 60, 61 on the shelf assembly, as well as a customer interface module 70 selectively connected to either one of the connectors 60, 61", the examiner respectively disagrees see above rejection.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2644

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jefferey F. Harold whose telephone number is (703) 306-5836. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Forester W. Isen can be reached on (703) 305-4386. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

JFH

JFH

December 31, 2001



FORESTER W. ISEN
SUPERINTENDING EXAMINER
TECHNICAL CENTER 2700